arXiv:1701.07350v1 [math.AP] 25 Jan 2017

Global folds between Banach spaces as perturbations

Marta Calanchi, Carlos Tomei and André Zaccur

Abstract

Global folds between Banach spaces are obtained from a simple geometric construction: a Fredholm operator T of index zero with one dimensional kernel is perturbed by a compatible nonlinear term P. The scheme encapsulates most of the known examples and suggests new ones. Concrete examples rely on the positivity of an eigenfunction. For the standard Nemitskii case $P(u) = f(u)$ (but P might be nonlocal, non-variational), T might be the Laplacian with different boundary conditions, as in the Ambrosetti-Prodi theorem, or the Schrödinger operators associated with the quantum harmonic oscillator or the Hydrogen atom, a spectral fractional Laplacian, a (nonsymmetric) Markov operator. For self-adjoint operators, we use results on the nondegeneracy of the ground state. On Banach spaces, a similar role is played by a recent extension by Zhang of the Krein-Rutman theorem.

Keywords: Ambrosetti-Prodi theorem, folds, Krein-Rutman theorem, positivity preserving semigroups.

MSC-class: 35J65, 47H15, 47H30, 58K05.

1 Introduction

A continuous function $F : X \to Y$ between real Banach spaces X and Y is a *global fold* if there is a Banach space W and homeomorphisms $\zeta : X \to W \oplus \mathbb{R}$ and $\xi : Y \to W \oplus \mathbb{R}$ for which $\tilde{F}(w,t) = \xi \circ F \circ \zeta^{-1}(w,t) = (w, -|t|)$. The celebrated Ambrosetti-Prodi theorem [1], refined and reinterpreted by subsequent work of Micheletti and Manes ([16]), Berger and Podolak ([5]) and Berger and Church ([6]), describes a class of functions given by nonlinear differential operators which are global folds (the result is presented below in this introduction).

More than a theorem, these works present a strategy to identify folds. In a similar vein, Church and Timourian ([11]) introduced other characterizations, leading to new examples and simpler arguments in known situations. Difficulties frequently arise when verifying the necessary hypotheses. The same authors also

provided sufficient conditions for a global fold, closer in spirit to Berger and Podolak ([5]), that are easier to check.

We take a similar point of view. Start with a Fredholm operator $T : X \to Y$ of index 0, $\dim \ker T = 1$, which by simple linear changes of variable becomes

$$T^a : W \oplus \mathbb{R} \to W \oplus \mathbb{R}, \quad T^a(w,t) = (w,0) \ ,$$

where $W = \operatorname{Ran} T$. For each $w_0 \in W$ fixed, the image under T^a of a vertical line $\{(w_0,t), t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is the point $(w_0,0)$. Consider a unimodal function $h^a(w_0,.)$ whose domain splits in two intervals on which it is first strictly increasing and then strictly decreasing, and suppose that $h^a(w_0,t) \to -\infty$ as $|t| \to \infty$. Clearly

$$(w,t) \in W \oplus \mathbb{R} \mapsto (w, h^a(w,t)) \in W \oplus \mathbb{R}$$

is a global fold. And a homeomorphism on the domain which keeps invariant each horizontal plane, $\Psi^a(w,t) = (F^a_t(w),t)$ preserves the fold structure. As we shall see, the familiar global folds described in [11] are of the form $F^a(w,t) = (F^a_t(w), h^a(F^a_t(w),t))$. This geometric approach leads also to algorithms for the numerical solution of a class of nonlinear differential equations ([24], [7]).

This approach motivates Theorem A, implicit in [23]. A continuous (resp. Lipschitz, C^k) map $F : X \to Y$ admits an *LS-decomposition* ([5], [8],[17],[18]) if there is a (Lipschitz, C^k) homeomorphism $\Phi : Y \to X$ and a continuous (Lipschitz, C^k) $h^a : W_Y \oplus \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $F^a = F \circ \Phi$ is a rank one nonlinear perturbation of the identity,

$$F^a : Y = (W_Y \oplus \mathbb{R}) \to W_Y \oplus \mathbb{R}\,, \quad (z,t) \mapsto (z, h^a(z,t))\,.$$

Clearly, F is a global fold if and only if F^a is. Singularity theorists say that F^a provides *adapted coordinates* to F.

Theorem A. *Suppose $F : X \to Y$ is a continuous map. If F satisfies the hypotheses below, it is either a homeomorphism or a global fold.*

(LS) F admits an LS-decomposition.

(PR) F is proper.

(NT) No point of Y has three preimages under F.

Theorem A implies Theorems 1 and 2 below, from which we obtain more examples of global folds, with simpler arguments. We consider $F(u) = Tu - P(u)$, where T is a linear operator and P a nonlinear perturbation. The Ambrosetti-Prodi theorem is the case $T = -\Delta - \lambda_m I$ with Dirichlet boundary conditions on a smooth bounded domain, λ_m is its smallest eigenvalue, and P is the operator $P(u) = f(u) - \lambda_m u$ for a strictly convex C^2 function $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $f'(\mathbb{R})$ intersects the spectrum of T only at λ_m. By taking appropriate translations, we may consider relevant eigenvalues of T to be different from zero.

We sacrifice generality and concentrate on two classes of *amenable* operators. An eigenvalue $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ of $T : X \to Y$ is *elementary* if

(I) $T - \lambda I : X \to Y$ is a Fredholm operator of index zero and $\ker(T - \lambda I)$ is spanned by the eigenvector ϕ.

(II) There is no $w \in X$ for which $(T - \lambda I)w = \phi$.

(III) λ is an isolated point of $\sigma(T)$.

Let $H = L^2(M, d\mu)$ for a σ-finite measure space (M, μ). A self-adjoint operator $T : D \subset H \to H$ is *m-amenable* if

(m-a) $\lambda_m = \min\ \sigma(T)$ is an elementary eigenvalue associated with a normalized eigenvector $\phi_m > 0$ a.e.

(m-b) For all $t > 0$, the operators $e^{-tT} : H \to H$ are positivity improving: for any nonzero $g \geq 0$, $e^{-tT} g > 0$ a.e.

Self-adjoint operators with positive ground state ϕ_m are the archetypical examples of m-amenability. Also, m-amenability will still hold for the Jacobians $DF(u) = T - DP(u)$ for *m-compatible* perturbations $P(u) : H \to H$, defined in Section 3. And such perturbations lead to folds.

Theorem 1. *Let $T : D \to H$ be an m-amenable operator and $P : D \to H$ and be an m-compatible C^1 function. Then $F = T - P : D \to H$ is a global fold.*

An operator $T : X \to X$ with spectral radius $r(T)$ is *M-amenable* if

(M-a) $r(T)$ is an elementary eigenvalue of T and $\sigma(T) \cap \{z \in \mathbb{C}, |z| = r\} = r(T)$.

(M-b) There is a cone $K \subset X$ with interior $\overset{\circ}{K} \neq \emptyset$ for which $T(K \setminus \{0\}) \subset \overset{\circ}{K}$.

Markov operators are related to M-amenability. The usual fact that $\phi_M \in \overset{\circ}{K}$ under small M-compatible perturbations $P(u)$, defined in Section 4, is proved by an extension of the Krein-Rutman theorem due to Zhang [29].

Theorem 2. *Let $T : X \to X$ be an M-amenable operator and $P : X \to X$ and be an M-compatible C^1 function. Then there is $R_T \in \mathbb{R}$ so that if, for all $u \in X$, we have $\|DP(u) - r(T)\ I\| < R_T$ then $F = T - P : X \to X$ is a global fold.*

Amenability of T and of a translation $T + R\ I$, for a large R, are essentially equivalent. As the attentive reader will notice along the text, this fact essentially masks the relevance of this feature in the original Ambrosetti-prodi context, when T is the Laplacian on a bounded set and $P(u) = f(u)$ is a Nemitskii operators , where $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ has bounded derivative.

In the self-adjoint case, the hypotheses needed for our arguments are given by spectral data of T. For M-amenable operators, however, we are limited to a perturbation result: the nonlinear term $P - r(T)\ I$ (or better, its Jacobian) has to be sufficiently small.

Most arguments are geometric and do not depend on the locality of amenable or compatible operators. We work with positive functions in the Hilbert context and privileged cones in Banach spaces, so as to preserve familiar procedures.

Smoothness is a key point in this text. In Section 2 we introduce hypotheses yielding (LS) and (PR) for a Lipschitz map F (providing details for arguments in [26], [8]), and the proofs of Theorems 1 and 2 then depend only on the verification of (NT). For Lipschitz compatible perturbations given by maps close to Nemitskii operators, a proof of (NT) is presented in Section 5.3. For more general compatible perturbations, we require that the maps F be C^1, and consider spectral properties of the Jacobians $DF(u)$ and some averages, the mean Jacobians $MF(u,v)$, defined in Section 3. For m-compatible operators, (NT) is obtained in Section 3 from the study of the smallest eigenvalue of mean Jacobians. In the M-compatible case instead it is the spectral radius which has to be controlled and we prove (NT) in Section 4.

As we shall see among the examples in Section 5.1, some amenable operators are the Laplacian itself (with Dirichlet, Neumann or periodic boundary conditions), the hydrogen atom $Tv = -\Delta v - v/r$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$, the quantum harmonic oscillator $Tv(x) = -v''(x) + x^2 v(x)$, spectral fractional Laplacians in bounded domains, integral operators with positive kernels. We consider only perturbations $T - P(u)$ but nonautonomous maps $T - P(x,u)$ may be handled with minor modifications. Section 5.2 comments on the rarity of global folds associated with compatible Nemitskii operators, a fact shown in [9] for the Laplacian. Section 5.3 shows an equivariant version of the Ambrosetti-Prodi theorem: in this case, the associated compatible operator is nonlocal.

For a C^2 function F, the differentiability of the eigenvalues of the Jacobians permits additional simplifications, as shown in Corollary 1. The result is then used in Section 5.5, which in a sense is an ideal situation. We describe a map from L^2 to L^2 which restricts appropriately to one from C^0 to C^0 with the following properties. There is sufficient (spectral) information of the self-adjoint kind to derive (LS) and (PR) on the L^2 scenario. We then transplant these facts to an associated map in C^0, on which the hypotheses leading to (NT) are especially weak, and end up with global folds in both scenarios.

This text provides the proofs of most of the results stated in [8].

2 Hypotheses (LS) and (PR), fibers and heights

The first two hypotheses of Theorem A, (LS) and (PR), admit a unified treatment for both kinds of amenable operators. There are other approaches to (LS) ([22], [17], also Section 5.5), which are not relevant in Sections 3 and 4.

For m-admissibile operators $T : D \to H$, the original Banach spaces are the real Hilbert space $Y = H = L^2(M, d\mu)$ and $X = D \subset H$, the domain of self-adjointness of T (with norm $\|u\|_D = \|u\| + \|Tu\|$). Let V be the subspace

spanned by ϕ_m, the eigenvector associated with the simple eigenvalue λ_m. Since T is m-admissible, $W_H = \mathrm{Ran}(T - \lambda_m\ I)$ is a closed subspace of codimension one. Then $W_D = W_H \cap D$ induce orthogonal decompositions

$$D = W_D \oplus V \quad , \qquad H = W_H \oplus V$$

and an orthogonal projection $\Pi : H \to W_H$. The restriction $T - \lambda_m\ I : W_D \to W_H$ is an invertible operator.

For M-admissible operators $T : X \to X$, $X = Y$ is a real Banach space. Let V be the span of ϕ_M, and set $W_X = \mathrm{Ran}(T - \lambda_M\ I)$, so that again there are decompositions $X = Y = W_X \oplus V$, a projection $\Pi : X \to W_X$ and an invertible restriction $T - \lambda_M\ I : W_X \to W_X$.

To unify notation, we write the functions of interest as

$$F = T - P : W_X \oplus V \to W_Y \oplus V$$

where the spaces are defined in terms of a privileged eigenpair (λ_p, ϕ_p) (p is m or M, depending on the type of amenability). We also write $\Pi : Y \to W_Y$. Define the translations $P_\gamma = P - \gamma I, T_\gamma = T - \gamma I : X \to Y$ and the restriction $T_{\gamma,W} = T_W - \gamma I : W_X \to W_Y$

Proposition 1. *Let $F = T - P : X \to Y$ for an amenable operator $T : X \to Y$ and assume*

(HLS) There exists $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ for which the restriction $T_{\gamma,W} : W_X \to W_Y$ is invertible and the map $\Pi P_\gamma : X \to W_Y$ is a Lipschitz function with a constant L satisfying $L\|T_{\gamma,W}^{-1}\| < 1$.

Then hypothesis (LS) holds for the map $F : X \to Y$.

The projection Π in (HLS) does not appear in arguments when P is a Nemitskii operator. Indeed, a function f whose derivatives takes values close to λ_p gives rise to a Nemitskii map $P(u)$ which looks pretty much like a multiple of the identity. Thus, f acts rather homogeneously in all directions of space. The situation for more general maps P is different: in adapted coordinates, as presented in the Introduction, large distortions along vertical lines in the image do not change the global nature of the fold. Such distortions correspond to large values of $P(u)$ along ϕ_m and are trivialized by the action of the projection Π.

Proof: The argument follows [5]. Write $u = \Pi u + t\phi_p = w + t\phi_p$, for $w \in W_X$. For $t \in \mathbb{R}$, define the projected restrictions $F_t : W_X \to W_Y$,

$$F_t(w) = \Pi F(w + t\phi_p) = \Pi(T - P)(w + t\phi_p) = T_{\gamma,W} w - \Pi P_\gamma(w + t\phi_p)\ .$$

Set $T_{\gamma,W} w = y$ to obtain

$$F_t \circ T_{\gamma,W}^{-1} : W_Y \to W_Y,\ F_t(y) = y - \Pi P_\gamma(T_{\gamma,W}^{-1} y + t\phi_p) = y - K_t(y).$$

We bound variations of $K_t : W_Y \to W_Y$. For $z, \tilde{z} \in W_Y$, $s, \tilde{s} \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\|K_s(z) - K_{\tilde{s}}(\tilde{z})\| = \|\Pi P_\gamma(T_{\gamma,W}^{-1} z + s\phi_p) - \Pi P_\gamma(T_{\gamma,W}^{-1}\tilde{z} + \tilde{s}\phi_p)\|$$

$$\leq L\|T_{\gamma,W}^{-1}(z - \tilde{z})\| + \mathcal{C}|s - \tilde{s}| \leq c\|z - \tilde{z}\| + \mathcal{C}|s - \tilde{s}|$$

for $c < 1$ by (HLS) and $\mathcal{C}$ possibly large.

From the Banach contraction theorem, $I - K_t : W_Y \to W_Y$ are (uniform) Lipschitz bijections. We show that the maps $(Id - K_t)^{-1} : W_Y \to W_Y$ are also uniformly Lipschitz: set $z_i = (Id - K_t)^{-1}(y_i),\ i = 1, 2$ and then

$$||z_1 - z_2|| \leq ||y_1 - y_2|| + ||K_t(z_1) - K_t(z_2)|| \leq ||y_1 - y_2|| + c||z_1 - z_2||$$

so that

$$\|z_1 - z_2\| \leq \frac{1}{1 - c}\ \|y_1 - y_2\| \ .$$

Thus $F_t = (I - K_t) \circ T_{\gamma,W} : W_X \to W_Y$ are also uniformly bilipschitz homeomorphisms. We now show that

$$\Phi^{-1} = \Psi = (F_t,\ \mathrm{Id}) : Y \to X$$

is a bilipschitz homeomorphism. Clearly, Ψ is a Lipschitz bijection. To handle $\Psi^{-1} = \Phi$, take $v = y + s\phi$ and $\tilde{v} = \tilde{y} + \tilde{s}\phi$ (the letter $\mathcal{C}$ represents different constants along the computations):

$$||\Phi(v) - \Phi(\tilde{v})||_X \leq \mathcal{C}\left(||(F_s)^{-1}(y) - (F_{\tilde{s}})^{-1}(\tilde{y})||_X + ||s\phi - \tilde{s}\phi||_X\right)$$

$$\leq \mathcal{C}\left(||(F_s)^{-1}(y) - (F_{\tilde{s}})^{-1}(y)||_X + ||(F_{\tilde{s}})^{-1}(y) - (F_{\tilde{s}})^{-1}(\tilde{y})||_X + |s - \tilde{s}|_X\right)$$

For the second term use the Lipschitz bound for $F_{\tilde{s}}^{-1}$. For the first, we prove $||F_s^{-1}(y) - F_{\tilde{s}}^{-1}(y)|| \leq \mathcal{C}|s - \tilde{s}|$. As before, set $w = F_s^{-1}(y), \tilde{w} = F_{\tilde{s}}^{-1}(y)$ and

$$z = T_{\gamma,W} \circ F_s^{-1}(y) = (1 - K_s)^{-1}(y)\ ,\ \tilde{z} = T_{\gamma,W} \circ F_{\tilde{s}}^{-1}(y) = (1 - K_{\tilde{s}})^{-1}(y)\ .$$

The iterations yielding z and $\tilde{z}$,

$$z_0 = 0,\ z_{j+1} = K_s(z_j) + y \ \text{ and } \ \tilde{z}_0 = 0,\ \tilde{z}_{j+1} = K_{\tilde{s}}(\tilde{z}_j) + y$$

imply the estimates

$$||z_{j+1} - \tilde{z}_{j+1}|| = ||K_s(z_j) - K_{\tilde{s}}(\tilde{z}_j))|| \leq c\ ||z_j - \tilde{z}_j|| + \mathcal{C}\ |s - \tilde{s}|\ ,$$

and for $j \to +\infty$,

$$||F_s^{-1}(y) - F_{\tilde{s}}^{-1}(y)|| = ||w - \tilde{w}|| \leq ||T_{\gamma,W}^{-1}||||z - \tilde{z}|| \leq \mathcal{C}\frac{||T_{\gamma,W}^{-1}||}{1 - c}\ |s - \tilde{s}|\ .$$

Adding up,

$$||\Phi(v) - \Phi(\tilde{v})||_X \leq \mathcal{C}\frac{||T^{-1}_{\gamma,W}||}{1-c}\ |s-\tilde{s}| + \mathcal{C}\|y-\tilde{y}\|_X + ||s\phi - \tilde{s}\phi||_X\ ,$$

completing the proof that $\Psi : X \to Y$ is a bilipschitz homeomorphism. Hypothesis (LS) is clear from the following diagram, for $F^a = F \circ \Phi$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} D = W_X \oplus V & \stackrel{F}{\longrightarrow} & H = W_Y \oplus V \\ {\scriptstyle \Psi=(F_t,Id)}\searrow & & \nearrow {\scriptstyle F^a=F\circ\Phi=(Id,h^a)} \\ & W_Y \oplus V & \end{array}$$

■

For a fixed $z \in W_Y$, the inverse of a vertical line $\{(z,s), s \in \mathbb{R}\}$ under Ψ is a *fiber* $\{u(z,t) = w(z,t) + t\phi_p,\ t \in \mathbb{R}\}$. The *height function* is

$$h : D = W_X \oplus V \to \mathbb{R},\ h(u) = \langle \phi_p, F(u)\rangle = \langle \phi_p,\ Tu - P(u)\rangle\ .$$

In the M-amenable case, the dual operator $T^* : X^* \to X^*$ also has a simple eigenvalue λ_M, associated with the eigenvector ϕ^*_M given by the functional which is zero on W_X and normalized so as $\langle \phi^*_M, \phi_M\rangle = 1$ (notice the coupling between X and X^*). To unify notation, set $\lambda^*_p = \phi_m$ or ϕ^*_M.

Proposition 2. *For $T : X \to Y$ amenable and $F = T - P : X \to Y$, assume*

(HPR) There exist $\lambda_-, \lambda_+, c_-, c_+ \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\lambda_- < \lambda_p < \lambda_+$ for which

$$\forall\ u \in X\ , \quad \langle \phi^*_p, P(u)\rangle\ \geq\ \lambda_-\ \langle \phi^*_p, u\rangle\ + c_-\ ,\ \lambda_+\ \langle \phi^*_p, u\rangle\ + c_+\ .$$

and (HLS). Then $F : X \to Y$ satisfies hypothesis (PR).

Proof: From (HPR), height functions go to $-\infty$ along fibers. Indeed,

$$h(u(z,t)) = \langle \phi_p, Tw(z,t) + tT\phi_p\rangle - \langle \phi_p, P(u(z,t))\rangle$$

$$= t\lambda_p - \langle \phi_p, P(u(z,t))\rangle\ \leq\ (\lambda_p - \lambda_-)\ t - c_-\ ,\ (\lambda_p - \lambda_+)\ t - c_+,$$

and the limits follow ($t \to -\infty$ from the first bound, $t \to \infty$ from the second), together with their uniformity in z. Since the homeomorphism $\Psi : D \to H$ preserves the horizontal component, $\lim_{|t|\to\infty} h^a(z,t) = -\infty$.

The properness of $F : D \to H$ is equivalent to that of $F^a : W_Y \oplus V \to W_Y \oplus V$, which we prove. Take $(z_n, y_n) = (z_n, h^a(z_n, t_n)) \to (z_\infty, y_\infty)$. If $|t_n| \to \infty$, then $h^a(z_\infty, t_n) \to -\infty$, contradicting the uniform convergence at z_∞. ■

A sketch of proof of Theorem A

By hypothesis (LS), Theorem A reduces to the statement that the proper map

$$F^a : W_Y \oplus \mathbb{R} \to W_Y \oplus \mathbb{R}\,, \quad (z,t) \mapsto (z, h^a(z,t))$$

is either a homeomorphism or a global fold. But, by hypothesis (NT), this is exactly Proposition 9 in [23]. ■

3 m-amenable operators

More general self-adjoint operators giving rise to global folds were presented before ([3]). Here we consider m-amenable operators $T : D \to H$: more concretely, the Banach spaces X and Y from the previous sections are $Y = H = L^2(M, d\mu)$ for a σ-finite measure space (M, μ) and $X = D \subset H$ is the domain of self-adjointness of T, equipped with the norm $\|u\|_D = \|u\|_H + \|Tu\|_H$. Euclidean space $D = H = \mathbb{R}^n$ is the case when μ is a finite collection of deltas.

The spectrum of $T : D \subset H \to H$ will be denoted by $\sigma(T)$. Following [21], we say that a function of $u \in H$ is *positive* if $u \geq 0$ *a.e.* and $u \neq 0$. A bounded operator $A : H \to H$ is *positivity preserving* if Au is positive for all positive u.

A C^1 function $P : H \to H$ is *m-compatible* with an m-amenable operator $T : D \to H$ if it satisfies the following properties. Let $\mu = \min \sigma(T) \setminus \{\lambda_m\}$.

(m-LS) There are $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, $a < \lambda_m < b < \mu$, such that, for $u \in D$, $DP(u) : H \to H$ is a bounded, symmetric operator with $\sigma(DP(u)) \subset [a, b]$.

(m-PR) There exist $\lambda_-, \lambda_+, c_-, c_+ \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\lambda_- < \lambda_m < \lambda_+$ for which

$$\forall\ u \in D\ , \quad \langle \phi_m, P(u) \rangle\ \geq\ \lambda_- \langle \phi_m, u \rangle\ + c_-\ ,\ \lambda_+ \langle \phi_m, u \rangle\ + c_+\ .$$

(m-NT1) For every $t > 0, u \in D$, $e^{tDP(u)} : H \to H$ is positive preserving.

(m-NT2) For $u, v \in D$, if $v - u > 0$ *a.e.* then $\inf \sigma(DF(v)) < \inf \sigma(DF(u))$.

As we shall see in Proposition 4, the m-amenability of T together with (m-LS) above implies the m-amenability of any Jacobian $DF(u) : D \to H$. In particular, there is a continuous function $\lambda_m : D \to \mathbb{R}$ which associates to $u \in D$ the smallest (elementary) eigenvalue of $DF(u)$ (and then $\lambda_m(DF(u)) = \inf \sigma(DF(u))$).

3.1 Proof of Theorem 1

We must verify hypotheses (LS), (PR) and (NT) of Theorem A for m-amenable operators and m-compatible C^1 perturbations.

Proposition 3. *Let $T : H \to D$ be m-amenable, and $P : H \to H$ be a C^1 map for which (m-LS) and (m-PR) hold. Then F satisfies (HLS) and (HPR).*

Proof: We show that (m-LS) implies (HLS) for $\gamma = (a+b)/2$. For $P_\gamma = P - \gamma I$ and $u(\tau) = \tau u + (1 - \tau)\tilde{u}$,

$$P_\gamma(u) - P_\gamma(\tilde{u}) = \int_0^1 DP_\gamma(u(\tau))\ \big(u - \tilde{u}\big)\ d\tau$$

and then, since $\|\Pi\| = 1$,

$$\|\Pi P_\gamma(u) - \Pi P_\gamma(\tilde{u})\| = \| \int_0^1 \Pi DP_\gamma(u(\tau)) \left(u - \tilde{u}\right) d\tau\| \leq (b-\gamma)\|u - \tilde{u}\| \ .$$

Thus $L = b-\gamma$ and since $\|T_{\gamma,W}^{-1}\| = \|(T_W - \gamma I)^{-1}\| \geq (\mu-\gamma)^{-1}$, (HLS) follows. Clearly (m-PR) implies (HPR). ■

In [23], (NT) was verified for weaker differentiability conditions, but less general perturbations P: the argument was given for Nemitskii operators which are only Lipschitz, and is presented in slightly modified form in Section 5.3. We need an extension of the argument.

By (m-LS), for all $u \in D$, the operators $DP(u) : H \to H$ are bounded, and by the Kato-Rellich theorem, the Jacobians $DF(u) = T - DP(u) : D \to H$ are self-adjoint. For $u, v \in D$, define the *mean Jacobian*

$$MF(u,v) = \int_0^1 DF(u + t(v-u))dt = T - \int_0^1 DP(u + t(v-u))dt \ ,$$

so that $MF = T - MP(u,v)$, for a symmetric, bounded operator $MP(u,v)$. Notice that $MF(u,u) = DF(u)$ and $MF(u,v) = MF(v,u)$: to simplify statements, we treat Jacobians as special cases of mean Jacobians.

Lemma A below is exercise 91 of Chapter XIII from [21], a result by Faris [13]. Lemma B is Theorem XIII.44 of [21]. A bounded self-adjoint operator $A : H \to H$ is *positivity improving* if for any nonzero $f \geq 0$, $Af > 0$ a.e.

Lemma A. *Let $T : D \to H$ be a self-adjoint operator for which e^{-tT}, $t > 0$, is positivity improving. Let $-V : H \to H$ be a positivity preserving bounded operator. Then, for $t > 0$, $e^{-t(T+V)}$ is positivity improving.*

Lemma B. *Let $T : D \to H$ be a self-adjoint operator that is bounded from below. Suppose that e^{-tT} is positivity preserving for all $t > 0$ and that $E = \min \sigma(T)$ is an eigenvalue. Then the following are equivalent.*

(a) E is a simple eigenvalue with a strictly positive eigenvector.

(b) For all $t > 0$, e^{-tT} is positivity improving.

Proposition 4. *For $u, v \in D$, if $0 \in \sigma(MF(u,v))$ then $0 = \min \sigma(MF(u,v))$. The operators $MF(u,v) : D \to H$ and $MF(u,v) : D \to H$ are m-amenable.*

Proof: Clearly (m-LS) holds for $DP(u)$ and $MP(u,v)$. By the Weyl inequalities, (m-LS) implies that the eigenvalues in $\sigma(T) \setminus \{\lambda_m\}$ are not perturbed enough to reach 0, and thus only the smallest eigenvalue of $MF(u,v)$ can be zero. We now prove m-amenability of $S = MF(u,v) = T - MP(u,v)$. For $t > 0$, e^{-tT} is positivity improving by (m-a) and $e^{tMP(u,v)}$ is positivity preserving by (m-NT1). By Lemma A, e^{-tS} is positivity improving, so that (m-b) holds for S. By Lemma B, condition (m-a) for S also holds. ■

We are ready for the proof of (NT). Suppose by contradiction that there is $g \in H$ with three preimages $u_1, u_2, u_3 \in D$, $F(u_1) = F(u_2) = F(u_3) = g$, so that

$$F(u_2) - F(u_1) = 0 = F(u_3) - F(u_2). \tag{1}$$

The u_i's belong to the same fiber (the inverse under F of the vertical line through g), so write $u_i = t_i\phi_m + w_i, i = 1, 2, 3$ for $t_1 < t_2 < t_3$ and $w_i \in W_D = \langle \phi_m \rangle^{\perp}$.

From the fundamental theorem of calculus,

$$F(u_{i+1}) - F(u_i) = \int_0^1 DF(tu_{i+1} + (1-t)u_i)\ dt\ (u_{i+1} - u_i)$$

$$= MF(u_{i+1}, u_i)(u_{i+1} - u_i) = 0\ , \quad i = 1, 2\ .$$

Thus $u_{i+1} - u_i \in \ker MF(u_{i+1}, u_i)$ and form the proposition above, the functions $u_{i+1} - u_i$ have a well defined sign. More,

$$\langle u_{i+1} - u_i\ ,\ \phi_m \rangle\ =\ \langle (t_{i+1}\phi_m + w_{i+1}) - (t_i\phi_m + w_i)\ ,\ \phi_m \rangle$$

$$=\ \langle (t_{i+1} - t_i)\ \phi_m\ ,\ \phi_m \rangle\ =\ t_{i+1} - t_i > 0$$

and since $\phi_m > 0$ we must have $u_3 > u_2 > u_1$ a.e.

The operators $MF(u_{i+1}, u_i), i = 1, 2$ both have a zero eigenvalue, at the bottom of their spectra, by Proposition 4. As $u_1 + t(u_2 - u_1) < u_2 + t(u_3 - u_2)$ for each $t \in [0, 1]$,thus the integrand defining $MF(u_2, u_1)$ is smaller than that of $MF(u_3, u_2)$. Since the smallest eigenvalue $\lambda_m(MF(u, v))$ is the minimal value of the associated quadratic form (and it is achieved!), zero cannot be a common eigenvalue. The proof of (NT) is complete.

Finally, $F : D \to H$ cannot be a homeomorphism, a possibility left by Theorem 1: at each fiber, F^a behaves like $x \to -x^2$, by the proof of (HPR). ■

4 M-amenable operators

Let X be a real Banach space, $\mathcal{B}(X)$ be the space of bounded linear operators from X to X equipped with the usual sup norm. Among the many almost equivalent definitions of the *essential spectrum* $\sigma_e(T)$ in [12], we use the fourth one,

$$\sigma_e(T) = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}\ :\ T - \lambda\ I : X \to X \text{ is not a Fredholm operator of index zero}\}\ .$$

Denote the spectral radius of T by $r(T)$ and the essential spectral radius by $r_e(T)$. The points of $\sigma(T)$ outside of the circle $\{|z| \leq r_e(T)\}$ are isolated eigenvalues of finite (algebraic) multiplicity. For the dual operator $T^* : X^* \to X^*$, $r(T^*) = r(T)$ and $r_e(T^*) = r_e(T)$, from the characterization in terms of Fredholm theory.

In this text, a *cone* $K \subset X$ is a closed set with nonempty interior $\overset{\circ}{K}$ for which

$$0 \in K\ , \quad K + K \subset K\ , \quad t \geq 0 \Rightarrow tK \subset K, \quad v, -v \in K \Rightarrow v = 0\ .$$

The *dual cone* $K^* = \{\ell \in X^* : \ell(x) \geq 0\ \forall x \in K\}$ then also has nonempty interior. An operator $T \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ is *positive* (resp. *strongly positive*) with respect to K if $TK \subset K$ (resp. $T(K \setminus \{0\}) \subset \overset{\circ}{K}$). Clearly, if $T : X \to X$ is positive (resp. strongly positive) with respect to K, then $T^* : X^* \to X^*$ is positive (resp. strongly positive) with respect to K^*.

It is easy to see that if $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ is an elementary eigenvalue of T, then it is also an elementary eigenvalue of $T^* : Y^* \to X^*$.

We will use Zhang's extension of Nussbaum's theorem ([29], [19]).

Theorem B. *Let $K \subset X$ be a cone and $T \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ be a strongly positive operator with respect to K with $r(T) > r_e(T)$. Then $\lambda_M = r(T)$ is an elementary eigenvalue of T with an associated eigenvector $\phi_M \in \overset{\circ}{K}$. Any other eigenvalue λ of T satisfies $|\lambda| < r(T)$. Moreover, λ_M is an elementary eigenvalue of $T^* \in \mathcal{B}(X^*)$, associated with an eigenvector $\phi_M^* \in \overset{\circ}{K^*}$, normalized so that $\phi_M^*(\phi_M) = 1$.*

From Theorem B, the M-amenable operators T and T^* have a common eigenvalue $\lambda_M = r(T)$ and eigenvectors $\phi_M \in \overset{\circ}{K}$ and $\phi_M^* \in \overset{\circ}{K^*}$. Also, the restriction $T_{\lambda_M,W} = T - \lambda_M\ I : W_X \to W_X$ is an invertible operator.

Since $\sigma(T)$ is bounded and $r(T) = \lambda_M$ is an elementary eigenvalue, the upper semi-continuity of the spectrum implies the existence of an open ball $B_{R(T)} \subset \mathcal{B}(X)$ centered at the origin with radius $R(T)$ such that the operator $T+S : X \to X$ also has an elementary eigenvalue of largest modulus $r(T+S) = \lambda_M(T+S)$ for $S \in B_{R(T)}$. Again, the largest eigenvalue $\lambda_M : B_{R(T)} \to \mathbb{R}$ is analytic. To avoid confusion, we denote by $r = r(T) = \lambda_M(T)$ the eigenvalue of largest modulus of T and reserve the notation λ_M for the eigenvalue as a function.

As in Section 3.1, for $u, v \in X$, we consider the Jacobian $DF(u) : X \to X$ and the mean Jacobian $MF(u, v) : X \to X$, $MF(u, v) = T - MP(u, v)$, for a bounded operator $MP(u, v) : X \to X$.

Let K be the cone associated with $T : X \to X$ and write $P = r + P_r$. A C^1 function $P : X \to X$ is *M-compatible* with T if it satisfies the properties below. Hypotheses (HLS) and (HPR) have been rewritten for P_r instead of P.

(M-LS) The maps $\Pi P_r(u) : X \to W_X$ are Lipschitz with a common constant L for which $L\|T_{r,W}^{-1}\| < 1$.

(M-PR) There exist $\lambda_-, \lambda_+, c_-, c_+ \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\lambda_- < r < \lambda_+$ such that

$$\forall\ u \in X, \quad \langle \phi_M^*, P_r(u) \rangle\ \geq\ (\lambda_- - r)\, \langle \phi_M^*, u \rangle\ + c_-\ ,\ (\lambda_+ - r)\, \langle \phi_M^*, u \rangle\ + c_+\ .$$

(M-NT1) For $u \in X$, $-DP(u)$ is positive with respect to K.

(M-NT2) For $v - u \in \overset{\circ}{K}$, $\lambda_M(DF(v) + r) < \lambda_M(DF(u) + r)$.

4.1 Proof of Theorem 2

We derive the counterpart of Propositions 3 and 4.

Proposition 5. *There is $R_T > 0$ such that, if for all $u \in X, \|DP_r(u)\| < R_T$, then (M-LS) holds. Also, for $u, v \in X$, if $0 \in \sigma(MF(u,v))$ then the spectral radius $\lambda_M(MF(u,v)+r)$ is $r = r(T)$. The operators $DF(u), MF(u,v) : D \to H$ are M-amenable with respect to the same cone K associated with T.*

Proof: To prove (M-LS), take $\gamma = r$ in the argument of Section 2. A small R implies a small Lipschitz constant for $P_r(u)$: an appropriate R implies (M-LS), since $T_{r,W}$ is fixed. It also implies small changes in DF, MF and their spectra, so that (M-a) and the statement for $MF(u,v)$ follows. The proof of (M-b) is trivial from (M-NT1). As in Proposition 3, (M-PR) implies (HPR). ■

Thus, an appropriate choice of R_T implies (HLS) and (HPR) for the mean Jacobians. We follow Section 3.1 and prove (NT). Three points $u_i = t_i\phi_M + w_i, i = 1,2,3$ with the same image imply

$$MF(u_{i+1}, u_i)(u_{i+1} - u_i) = 0 \ , \ i = 1, 2 \ .$$

From the M-amenability of MF proven in Proposition 5 and Theorem B,

$$u_2 - u_1, \ u_3 - u_2 \in \mathring{K} \quad \text{for} \quad t_1 < t_2 < t_3 \ .$$

From (M-NT1), the spectral radius of $MF(u_2, u_1) + r$ and $MF(u_3, u_2) + r$ is $r = \lambda_M$. From (M-NT2),

$$r \ = \ \lambda_M(MF(u_2, u_1) + r) < \lambda_M(DF(u_2) + r) < \lambda_M(MF(u_3, u_2) + r) \ = r \ ,$$

and we are done: as in Section 3, $F : X \to X$ cannot be a homeomorphism. ■

The presence of R_T in the statement of Theorem 2 is the price of considering operators which are not self-adjoint. Some improvements are possible in special cases. The main result in [23] is about a Berestycki-Nirenberg-Varadhan operator $T : W^{2,n}(\Omega) \to L^n(\Omega)$, for a bounded set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with smooth boundary [4]. It is not self-adjoint, but admits an eigenvalue λ_m of smallest real part. Given $a < \lambda_m$, there is $b(a) > \lambda_m$ such that, for any Lipschitz strictly convex function $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ with $f'(\mathbb{R}) = (a, b(a))$, the map $F(u) = Tu - P(u) : W^{2,n}(\Omega) \to L^n(\Omega)$ is a global fold. The additional structure implies the positivity of ground states from a maximal principle.

Section 5.5 presents a scenario in which spectral estimates are available for a map between Banach spaces.

5 Examples, variations, remarks

5.1 Some amenable operators

The identification of operators T generating positivity preserving semigroups (hypothesis (m-b)) is by itself a field of mathematics. Arguments in the spirit of Bochner's theorem characterizing distributions of positive type and the Levy-Khintchine formula (Appendix 2 to Section XIII.12, [21], vol.IV) lead to a wealth of examples of such operators. If an operator T_0 satisfies (m-b), few weak hypotheses suffice to obtain (m-b) for $T = T_0 + V$, from the Lie-Trotter formula.

We list a few examples, chosen in order to indicate different techniques.

Proposition 6. *The following operators are m-amenable.*

(I) $-\Delta$ *for Dirichlet, Neumann, periodic or mixed boundary conditions on bounded smooth domains.*

(II) The Schrödinger operator for the hydrogen atom in $\mathbb{R}^3$, $Tv = -\Delta v - v/r$.

(III) The quantum oscillator in $\mathbb{R}$, $Tv(x) = -v''(x) + x^2 v(x)$.

(IV) Fractional powers $T^s, s \in (0,1)$ *of positive m-amenable operators.*

(V) Spectral fractional Laplacians on bounded smooth domains.

Proof: Hypothesis (m-a) is standard for all examples, we check (m-b). For (I), see Sections 8.1 and 8.2 of [2]. For (II), take $T_0 = -\Delta$ in its usual domain $H^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$. For the potential $V = -1/r$, and define $T = T_0 + V$. We prove (m-b) for T using a perturbation argument, Theorem XIII.45, vol. IV of [21]. Define the bounded truncations V_n which coincide with V for $|x| > 1/n$ and are zero otherwise. Set $q_n = V - V_n$. Both T_0 and T are bounded from below. Comparing quadratic forms,

$$T \leq T_0 + V_n \quad \text{and} \quad T_0 \leq T - V_n \ ,$$

so that $T_0 + V_n$ and $T - V_n$ are uniformly bounded from below. We are left with showing that $T_0 + V_n \to T$ and $T - V_n \to T_0$ in the strong resolvent sense. By Theorem VIII.25, vol. I of [21] it suffices to show that, for a given $u \in H^2$,

$$q_n \, u \to 0 \quad \text{in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \ , \quad \text{i.e.} \quad \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \int_{|x| \leq \epsilon} \frac{u^2(x)}{|x|^2} \, dx \ = \ 0 \ ,$$

which is true, since $H^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ consists of bounded, continuous functions. The proof of (III) is similar. For (IV), use the arguments with Laplace transforms in Section IX.11 of [27] (see also [25]). Finally, (V) is a special case of (IV). ■

What about M-amenable operators? Any operator satisfying the hypothesis of Theorem B would do, for example.

5.2 Nemitskii operators revisited

In the standard Ambrosetti-Prodi theorem, the associated compatible perturbation is a Nemitskii map $P(u) = f(u)$ for a strictly convex function $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$.

Our original motivation for considering more general compatible perturbations was the realization ([9]) that convexity was essentially a *necessary* condition to obtain global folds for $F(u) = -\Delta u - f(u)$. It turns out that this property carries through to other amenable operators, once a technical hypothesis on the behavior of eigenvectors detailed in Theorem 1 of [9] is satisfied.

Nemitskii maps between Hölder spaces are smooth, but are usually only Lipschitz between Hilbert spaces, so that Jacobians and their eigenvalues are not available. This difficulty led to the arguments for (LS) presented in Section 2 and those for (NT) illustrated in Section 5.3 for a nonlocal variation.

The convexity of f suggests a more stringent hypothesis on P leading to a simpler proof of (NT) in the m-amenable scenario. The strict convexity of f gives

$$x < y < z \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{f(y) - f(x)}{y - x} \; < \; \frac{f(z) - f(y)}{z - y}$$

and we are led to the following alternative.

(m-NT3) If $u < v < w$, then $\langle w - v, P(v) - P(u) \rangle \; < \; \langle v - u, P(w) - P(v) \rangle$.

To prove (NT) assuming (m-NT3) instead of (m-NT2), suppose again, by contradiction, that $F(u) = F(v) = F(w) = g$ with $u < v < w$ and

$$T(v - u) - (P(v) - P(u)) = 0 = T(w - v) - (P(w) - P(v)) \; .$$

Take inner products,

$$\langle w - v \; , \; T(v - u) - (P(v) - P(u) \rangle = 0 = \langle v - u \; , \; T(w - v) - (P(w) - P(v)) \rangle$$

and use the self-adjointness of T to derive the contradiction

$$\langle w - v \; , \; P(v) - P(u) \rangle \; = \; \langle v - u \; , \; P(w) - P(v) \rangle \; .$$

5.3 An equivariant case: nonlocal Nemitskii operators

Take a closed subgroup $G \subset SO(n, \mathbb{R})$ of rigid motions and a bounded, smooth, domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ which is invariant under the natural action of G. Thus G might be $SO(n, \mathbb{R})$ acting on the unit ball, or $G = \{I, -I\}$ and Ω an even set, $x \in \Omega \Leftrightarrow -x \in \Omega$. Denote by H_G the subspace of G-invariant functions and by $\pi : H \to H_G$ the associated orthogonal projection. An explicit formula for π is obtained by taking averages: for the normalized Haar measure μ on G,

$$\pi u(x) = \int_G u \circ g(x) \; d\mu(g) \; ,$$

so that π is positive preserving. Take as an example the Laplacian on Ω (with Dirichlet, Neumann, periodic b.c.) $T = -\Delta : D \to H = L^2(\Omega)$. Its first eigenvalue λ_m is simple and the associated eigenfunction $\phi_m > 0$ is G-invariant (take averages and use the simplicity of λ_m).

Proposition 7. *Let $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a Lipschitz strictly convex function such that*

$$\overline{f'(\mathbb{R})} \cap \sigma(-\Delta) = \{\lambda_m\} \ .$$

Set $P : H \to H, P = f \circ \pi$. Then $F = T - P : D \to L^2(\Omega)$ is a global fold.

Since f is Lipschitz, f' exists a.e. Write the hypothesis in terms of the usual Lipschitz quotients: for $\lambda_- = \inf f', \lambda_+ = \sup f'$,

$$\lambda_- \ (x - y) \ < \ f(x) - f(y) \ < \ \lambda_+ \ (x - y) \ , \quad \forall \ x, y \in \mathbb{R} \ .$$

Proof: We use Theorem A. The verification of (LS) imitates Section 2, since a Lipschitz map f yields a Nemitskii operator $N_f : H \to H$ which is also Lipschitz. We consider (PR). By hypothesis,

$$\lambda_- < \lambda_m < \lambda_+ < \min \ (\sigma(T) \setminus \{\lambda_m\}) \ .$$

From the convexity of f, there are constants $c_-, c_+ \in \mathbb{R}$ for which

$$\langle \phi_m, f(u) \rangle \ \geq \ \lambda_- \langle \phi_m, u \rangle \ + c_- \ , \ \lambda_+ \langle \phi_m, u \rangle \ + c_+$$

and, since $\pi \phi_m = \phi_m$, we obtain (m-PR),

$$\langle \phi_m, P(u) \rangle \ = \ \langle \phi_m, f(\pi u) \rangle \ \geq \ \lambda_- \langle \phi_m, u \rangle \ + c_- \ , \ \lambda_+ \langle \phi_m, u \rangle \ + c_+ \ .$$

We prove (NT) following the argument in [23]. Suppose by contradiction that there exist three distinct functions u_i for which

$$Tu_i - P(u_i) = Tu_i - f(\pi u_i) = z \ , \quad i = 1, 2, 3.$$

Then, for $i = 1, 2$,

$$T(u_{i+1} - u_i) - (P(u_{i+1}) - P(u_i)) = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \big(T - V_{i+1,i}\big)(u_{i+1} - u_i) = 0$$

for the real, bounded potential

$$V_{i+1,i}(x) := \begin{cases} \dfrac{f(\pi u_{i+1}) - f(\pi u_i)}{u_{i+1} - u_i} & , \ \text{for } x \in \Omega \ : \ u_i(x) \neq u_{i+1}(x). \\ a & , \ \text{for } x \in \Omega \ : \ u_i(x) = u_{i+1}(x). \end{cases}$$

From the hypothesis, the only eigenvalue associated with a potential $V_{i+1,i}$ which can be 0 is the smallest. Thus the ground states $u_2 - u_1$ and $u_3 - u_2$ have a

definite sign and are G-invariant. Moreover, since the three preimages u_i lie in the same fiber, i.e., $u_i = w_i + t_i\phi_m$, we may suppose without loss that $t_1 < t_2 < t_3$ and thus, by taking inner products with $\phi_m > 0$,

$$u_1 < u_2 < u_3 \quad \text{and thus} \quad \pi u_1 < \pi u_2 < \pi u_3 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega \ .$$

From the strict convexity of f, and the equivariance of $u_{i+1} - u_i$,

$$V_{2,1} \ = \ \frac{f(\pi u_2) - f(\pi u_1)}{\pi u_2 - \pi u_1} < \ \frac{f(\pi u_3) - f(\pi u_2)}{\pi u_3 - \pi u_2} \ = \ V_{3,2}$$

and thus zero cannot be the smallest eigenvalue of $V_{2,1}$ and $V_{3,2}$. Again, as in Section 2, F cannot be a homeomorphism. ■

The case $G = \{e\}$ is the usual Ambrosetti-Prodi theorem.

5.4 A geometric corollary

We present a result with a strong geometric content. For real Banach spaces $X \subset Y$, let $F : X \to Y$ be a C^2 map satisfying (LS). As in Section 2, the C^2 diffeomorphism $\Phi : Y \to X$ takes vertical lines

$$\{z + t\phi_p, \ t \in \mathbb{R}\} \subset W_Y \oplus \mathbb{R}$$

to fibers in X, on which one may prescribe a uniform orientation, the one corresponding to going up along vertical lines in Y. Let $\phi(u)$ be the normal tangent vector to the fiber at $u \in X$ which is compatible with this orientation.

The *critical set* $\mathcal{C}$ of F consists of *critical points*, where $DF(u_c) : X \to Y$ is not an linear isomorphism. We assume the following hypothesis.

(C1) For all $u_c \in \mathcal{C}$, $\lambda(u_c) = 0$ is an elementary eigenvalue of $DF(u_c) : X \to Y$.

From hypothesis (LS), at a critical point $u_c \in \mathcal{C}$, $\phi(u_c)$ generates $\ker DF(u_c)$: simply check the statement in adapted coordinates, i.e., for

$$F^a : X = (W_X \oplus \mathbb{R}) \to W_X \oplus \mathbb{R} \, , \quad (z, t) \mapsto (z, h^a(z, t)) \ .$$

Moreover, $\lambda(u_c) = 0$ is also an elementary eigenvalue of $DF(u_c)^* : Y^* \to X^*$, associated with the eigenvector $\phi^*(u_c) \in Y^*$ given by the functional which is zero on $W_Y = \operatorname{Ran} DF(u_c)$ and normalized so that $\langle \phi^*(u_c), \phi(u_c) \rangle = 1$ (the normalization is possible because 0 is an elementary eigenvalue).

From the Appendix, there is a (unique) C^1 function $\lambda : U \to \mathbb{R}$ from an open neighborhood $U \subset X$ of u_c with $\lambda(u_c) = 0$ and $\lambda(u)$ is an eigenvalue of $DF(u)$. We also require that 0 is a regular value of λ:

(C2) At a critical point $u_c \in X$, $D\lambda(u_c) : X \to \mathbb{R}$ is nonzero.

By the inverse function theorem, $\mathcal{C}$ is a codimension 1 manifold of X. The corollary below uses the notation of the previous paragraphs. Recall that ϕ_p^* is the normalized eigenfunction of $T^* : Y^* \to X^*$ associated with λ_p.

Corollary 1. *Let $F : X \subset Y \to Y$ be a proper C^2 function satisfying (LS), (PR), (C1), (C2) and (C3) below.*

(C3) For each $u_c \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\phi(u_c) \neq 0$ and $DF(u_c)\phi(u_c) = 0$,

$$\langle\ \phi_p^*\ ,\ [D(DF(u_c))\ \phi(u_c)]\ \phi(u_c)\ \rangle\ < 0\ .$$

Then $F : X \to Y$ is either a homeomorphism or a global fold.

The expression $[D(DF(u))\ \phi(u)]$ is the directional derivative of the Jacobian $DF(u)$ along $\phi(u)$ and the inner product in (C3) is the directional derivative of the zero eigenvalue of $DF(u)$ along $\phi(u_c)$. In words, the eigenvalue of $DF(u)$ which is zero at u_c always decreases when going up along a fiber. In [9], the authors show that the quotient $\lambda(u)/h(u)$ extends to a strictly positive continuous function: said differently, at a critical point u_c the growth properties of the height function along a fiber are equivalent to those of the eigenvalue of $DF(u)$ near zero.

The sign in hypothesis (C3) is reversible. Our choice above is compatible with the behavior of F along fibers used throughout the text.

Proof: Since $F : X \to Y$ is a C^2 function, hypothesis (C1) and Lemma 1 in the Appendix imply that, near a point $u_c \in \mathcal{C}$ the eigenvalue of $DF(u) : X \to Y$ admits a (unique) C^1 continuation. We follow this eigenvalue as we move up along a fiber. Take the directional derivative along the tangent vector $\phi(u_c)$ to the fiber (which also spans $\ker DF(u_c)$) and use the chain rule $u \mapsto DF(u) \mapsto \lambda(DF(u))$ combined with the formula in the lemma,

$$D\lambda(DF(u_c)) \cdot \phi(u_c) = \langle\ \phi^*\ ,\ [D(DF(u_c))\ \phi(u_c)]\ \phi(u_c)\ \rangle\ ,$$

which is *negative*, according to (C3). Said differently, as we move up along the fiber, whenever we pass by a point u_c for which $\lambda(u_c) = 0$, it must decrease. Thus there can be no two such points in a fiber. And hence there are no points in Y with three preimages, since they would have to belong to the same fiber. Hypothesis (PR) completes the argument: F is proper, but is not a homeomorphism. ■

5.5 A hybrid: transplanting fibers

We present a variant of the extension by Church and Timourian ([11]) of a global fold described by Mandhyan ([15]). We treat Nemitskii maps for simplicity.

For a compact set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, let $H = L^2(\Omega)$, $X = C^0(\Omega)$ with the usual norms. We require some hypotheses for $G_H : H \to H$, $G_H(u) = Eu - g(u)$ and its restriction $G_X : X \to X$.

(E1) The linear operator $E : H \to X$ is bounded, defines a symmetric operator $E_H : H \to H$ and a (bounded) restriction $E_X : X \to X$.

(E2) $\|E_H\| = \lambda_M$ is an elementary eigenvalue of E_H with an eigenvector $\phi_M > 0$ a.e. Assume $0 < \mu = \max \sigma(E_H) \setminus \{\lambda_M\} < \lambda_M$.

(E3) $E_X : X \to X$ is a positivity preserving operator.

(G1) $g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a strictly convex C^2 function with $g'(\mathbb{R}) = (a, b)$ satisfying

$$\mu < a < \lambda_M < b.$$

(G2) For each critical point $u_c \in X$ of G_X, there is $R = R(u_c) > 0$ for which

$$R \;=\; r(R\, I + DG_X(u_c)) > r_e(R\, I + DG_X(u_c))\ .$$

Theorem 3. *Under these hypotheses for E and g, the maps $G_H : H \to H$ and its restriction $G_X : X \to X$ are global folds.*

The Ambrosetti-Prodi map $u \mapsto -\Delta u - f(u)$ may suggest the inversion of the Laplacian, yielding maps of the form $u \mapsto -Ef(u)$. A map like G_X comes up if we go one step beyond: since f' is bounded away from zero (and in the original Ambrosetti-Prodi theorem may be either strictly convex or strictly concave), use $g = f^{-1}$ to invert the nonlinear part $u \mapsto f(u)$ (below, we take g convex to minimize bifurcations). This phrasing is closer in spirit to the M-amenable scenario, in which the nonlinearity interacts with the largest eigenvalue.

We deduce Theorem 3 again from Theorem A, but complications arise. The proof of (LS) for $G_H : H \to H$ is easy. We then use Theorem B in order to obtain (LS) for $G_X : X \to X$ and juxtapose information from both approaches.

Proof: The proof breaks in steps.

0. The eigenvector ϕ_M lies in X.
Indeed, $E_H\phi_M = \lambda_M\phi_M$, with $\lambda_M \neq 0$ and $\operatorname{Ran} E_H \subset X$ by (E1).

1. (HLS) and (HPR) hold for $G_H : H \to H$.
Just mimic Section 4. Again, split $H = W_H \oplus V$, where ϕ_M spans V and $W_H = V^\perp$. Fibers, the inverses of vertical lines $V_z = \{(z, t), t \in \mathbb{R}\}$, are Lipschitz curves parameterized by height $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $u(t) = w(z, t) + t\phi_M, w(t) \in W_H$.

2. If $G_H(u) = x$ for $x \in X$, then $u \in X$.
Set $g^{-1} = f$ (recall that g is strictly increasing): both Nemitskii operators $u \mapsto g(u)$ and $w \mapsto f(w)$ take H to H and X to X. Write $G_H(u) = Eu - g(u) = Ef(w) - w$, so that $G_H(u) = x$ implies that $w = Ef(w) - x \in X$, since $E\, H \subset X$, by (E1). But then $u = f(w) \in X$.

Since $\phi_M \in X$, a vertical line V_x through a point $x \in X$ is completely in X. From the previous step, their inverses, which are fibers in H, are necessarily in X. To show that (HLS) and (HPR) hold for $G_X : X \to X$, we prove that each fiber $\alpha_u = G_H^{-1}(V_x) \subset X$ contained in X is indeed a C^2 curve in X.

3. Let $u_c \in X$ be a critical point of G_X. The eigenvalue 0 of $DG_X(u_c) : X \to X$ is elementary and there is a normal positive vector $\phi_M(u_c)$ spanning $\ker DG_X(u_c)$.

This follows from (G2) and Theorem B applied to $R\ I + DG(u)$ for a large $R > 0$. The kernel vector $\phi_M(u_c)$ is not in $W_X = V^\perp$, since $\phi_M(u_c), \phi_M > 0$.

Split $X = W_X \oplus V$, where again $W_X = V^\perp \subset X$ and $\Pi : X \to W_X$ is $\Pi v = v - \langle \phi_M,\ v \rangle\ \phi_M$.

4. The projected restrictions $\Pi(G_t)_X : W_X \to W_X\ ,\ w \mapsto \Pi G(w + t\phi_M)$ are local diffeomorphisms for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

We prove the invertibility of $\Pi D(G_t)_X(w) : W_X \to W_X$ for every $w \in W_X$. The images of the maps $D(G_t)_X(w) : W_X \to W_X$ are closed, either because for $u = w + t\phi_M\ DG_X(u) : X \to X$ is an isomorphism or because 0 is an elementary eigenvalue of $DG_X(u)$. Moreover, the extensions $D(G_t)_H(w) : W_H \to W_H$ never contain ϕ_M in their range, from the argument which proves (LS) for $G_H : H \to H$, so that the restriction of Π to $\operatorname{Ran} D(G_t)_X$ is also an isomorphism.

5. Near every $u \in X$, the set $\alpha_u = G_H^{-1}(V_x) \subset X$ is an arc near u.

An *arc* is the image of a C^1 function $\gamma : (-1, 1) \to X$ admitting a continuous, injective extension to $[-1, 1]$. At a regular point $u \in X$, $DG(u) : X \to Y$ is invertible: from the inverse function theorem, the inversion of small segments of vertical lines through $G(u)$ consists of an arc. Now take a critical point $u_c \in X$ of G_X. Simply stack the local diffeomorphisms obtained in the previous step: again, we obtain the required arc.

We completed the proof of the next step: fibers have been transplanted.

6. (HLS) and (HPR) hold for $G_X : X \to X$.

We are left with proving (NT), both for $G_X : X \to X$ and $G_H : H \to H$. Here instead we start with G_X. Since G_X is smooth, we may use Corollary 1. Its hypotheses are verified with systematic use of Theorem B to the Jacobians $DG_X(u_c) : X \to X$ (or better, $RI + DG_X(u_c)$ for large R). At a critical point u_c the eigenvalue 0 is elementary and the associated eigenvector $\phi(u_c)$ is positive (as well as the dual eigenvector $\phi^*(u_c)$, which may be interpreted as $\phi(u_c)$ itself by the self-adjointness of $DG_H : H \to H$).

From Lemma 1 in the Appendix, the zero eigenvalue at u_c is C^1 and

$$D\lambda(u_c)S = \langle \phi(u_c),\ [D(DF(u_c))\ \phi(u_c)]\ \phi(u_c)\ \rangle = \langle \phi(u_c),\ -g''(u_c)\phi(u_c)^2\ \rangle\ < 0$$

so that from Corollary 1, we have (NT) for G_X.

Finally, if there is a fiber of G_H with three preimages, then a nearby fiber completely in X also admits three preimages, which we have just shown to be impossible. We leave the density arguments to the reader. ■

We finish indicating some hypotheses leading to (G2). We need some easy facts from spectral theory. Fix $u \in X$.

I. The eigenvalues of $DG_X(u)$ and $DG_H(u)$ are the same.

Clearly eigenvalues of $DG_X(u)$ are eigenvalues of $DG_H(u)$. If $DG_H(u)v = \lambda v$ then $E_H v - g'(u)v = \lambda v$ and again, since $g'(u) \in X$, we have $v \in X$.

II. $\sigma(DG_X(u)) \cup \{0\} \subseteq \sigma(DG_H(u)) \cup \{0\}$.

Let $\nu \neq 0$ belong to the resolvent of $DG_H(u)$. If $DG_X(u) - \nu I : X \to X$ is not injective, there is an eigenvector in X and then $\nu \in \sigma(DG_H(u))$. Also, for $x \in X$, the equation $DG_H(u)v - \nu v = x$ has a solution $v \in H$: mimic the argument above to show that $v \in X$. Thus $DG_X(u) - \nu I : X \to X$ is an isomorphism.

III. For a continuous function $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ with $\overline{f(\mathbb{R})} = [a, b]$, consider the multiplication operators $M_X : X \to X$ and $M_H : H \to H$, $u \mapsto fu$. Then

$$\sigma(M_X) = \sigma_e(M_X) = \sigma(M_H) = \sigma_e(M_H) = [a, b] \ .$$

This is a simple computation related to solving $fu = \lambda u$.

By hypothesis, λ_M is an elementary eigenvalue of E_H. Standard perturbation arguments then imply that $0 \in \sigma(DG_H(u_c))$ is an elementary eigenvalue and the rest of the spectrum of $DG_H(u_c)$ is to its left. From (I), 0 is a common eigenvalue of $DG_H(u_c)$ and $DG_X(u_c)$, and, from (II), $\sigma(DG_X(u_c)) \subset \sigma(DG_H(u_c))$, so that $\sigma(DG_X(u_c))$ is real and negative. Thus, for large R,

$$R \ = \ r(R\ I + DG_H(u_c)) = \ r(R\ I + DG_X(u_c)) \ .$$

If E_X is compact, Weyl's lemma implies (for weaker hypotheses, see [14])

$$\sigma_e(R\ I + DG_X(u_c)) = \sigma_e(R\ I - g'(u_c) + E_X) = \sigma_e(R\ I - g'(u_c)) = [R - b, R - a] \ ,$$

by (III), and then (G2) holds.

Another simple hypothesis leading to (G2) is

$$\sigma(DG_X(u_c)) \setminus \{0\} \subset \mathbb{C}_- = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \ , \Re z < 0\} \ .$$

Indeed, for each $z \in \mathbb{C}_-$, there is $R(z)$ for which $|R(z) + z| < R$. Such $R(z)$ may be taken to be the same for all $z \in \sigma(DG_X(u_c)) \setminus \{0\}$ by compactness and (G2) follows, since R is an eigenvalue of $R\ I + DG_X(u_c)$ not in its essential spectrum.

Appendix: Smoothness of simple eigenvalues

We use a simplified version of Proposition 79.15 from [28]. For real Banach spaces $X \subset Y$, $\mathcal{B}(X,Y)$ is the Banach space of bounded linear maps from X to Y with the operator norm. Let $T_0 \in \mathcal{B}(X,Y)$ and $T_0^* \in \mathcal{B}(Y^*,X^*)$ have an elementary eigenvalue $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ (defined in the Introduction) associated with the eigenvector $\phi_0 \in X$ of T_0 and ϕ_0^* of $T_0^* : Y^* \to X^*$, so that $\langle \phi_m^*, \phi_m \rangle = 1$.

Lemma 1. *Suppose $T_0 \in B(X,Y)$ as above. Then there are open neighborhoods $U_0 \subset \mathcal{B}(X,Y)$ of T_0 and $\Lambda_0 \subset \mathbb{R}$ of λ_0 for which every operator $T \in U_0$ has a unique eigenvalue $\lambda(T) \in \Lambda_0$. This eigenvalue is elementary and defines an analytic map $T \mapsto \lambda(T)$ with $\lambda(T_0) = \lambda_0$. Appropriately normalized eigenvectors $\phi(T), \phi^*(T), T \in U_0$ are also smooth. Finally, along any direction $S \in B(X,Y)$,*

$$D\lambda(T) \,.\, S \;=\; \langle\, \phi^*(T) \;,\; S\, \phi(T) \,\rangle \;.$$

5.6 Acknowledgements

The first author acknowledges support from GNAMPA. The second and third authors from CAPES, CNPq and FAPERJ.

References

[1] A. Ambrosetti and G. Prodi, *On the inversion of some differentiable mappings with singularities between Banach spaces*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. 93 (1972) 231-246.

[2] W. Arendt, *Semigroups and Evolution Equations: Functional Calculus, Regularity and Kernel Estimates*, Handbook Differential Equations, Eds. C.M. Dafermos and E. Feireisl, vol. I (2004), Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1-86.

[3] H. Berestycki, *Le nombre des solutions de certain problèmes sémi-linéaires elliptiques*, J. Funct. Anal. 40 (1981), 1-29.

[4] H. Berestycki, L. Nirenberg and S.R.S. Varadhan, *The principal eigenvalue and maximum principle for second-order elliptic operators in general domains*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 47 (1994) 47-92.

[5] M.S. Berger and E. Podolak, *On the solutions of a nonlinear Dirichlet problem*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 24 (1974) 837-846.

[6] M.S. Berger and P.T. Church,*Complete integrability and perturbation of a nonlinear Dirichlet problem. I.*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 28 (1979), 935-952.

[7] J.T. Cal Neto and C. Tomei, *Numerical analysis of semilinear elliptic equations with finite spectral interaction*, J.Math.Anal.Appl. 395 (2012) 63-77.

[8] M. Calanchi, C. Tomei and A. Zaccur, *Fibers and global geometry of functions*, Contributions to Nonlinear Elliptic Equations and Systems, PNLDE 86, Springer, Cham (2015), 55-75.

[9] M. Calanchi, C. Tomei and A. Zaccur, *Cusps and a converse to the Ambrosetti-Prodi Theorem*, to appear in Ann. Sc. Norm. Sup. Pisa.

[10] P.T. Church and J.G. Timourian, *Global fold maps in differential and integral equations*, Nonlinear Anal. 18 (1992) , 743-758.

[11] P.T. Church and J.G. Timourian, *Global Structure for Nonlinear Operators in Differential and Integral Equations I. Folds*, Topological Nonlinear Analysis, II, Progr. Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl., 27, Birkhäuser, Boston, MA, (1997) 109-160.

[12] D.E. Edmunds and W.D. Evans, *Spectral theory and differential operators*, Oxford University Press (1987).

[13] W. Faris, *Invariant cones and uniqueness of the ground state for Fermion systems*, J. Math. Phys 13 (1972), 1285-1290.

[14] K. Latrach and A. Dehici, *Fredholm, Semi-Fredholm Perturbations, and Essential Spectra*, J. Math. Anal. Appl 259 (2001), 277-301.

[15] I. Mandhyan, *The diagonalization and computation of some nonlinear integral operators*, Nonlinear Anal. 23 (1994), 447-466.

[16] A. Manes and A.M. Micheletti, *Un'estensione della teoria variazionale classica degli autovalori per operatori ellittici del secondo ordine*, Boll. Unione Mat. Ital. 7 (1973) 285-301.

[17] I. Malta, N. Saldanha and C. Tomei, *Morin singularities and global geometry in a class of ordinary differential operators*, Topol. Meth. Nonlin. Anal. 10, 137-169, 1997.

[18] B. Morin, *Formes canoniques des singularités d'une application différentiable*, C. R. Acad. Sci. 260 (1965), 5662-5665, 6503-6506.

[19] R. Nussbaum, *Eigenvectors of nonlinear positive operators and the linear Krein-Rutman theorem*, Fixed Point Th. (1981), 309-330.

[20] E. Podolak,*On the range of operator equations with an asymptotically nonlinear term*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 25, 12 (1976) 1127-1137.

[21] M. Reed and B. Simon, *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics*, vols. I-IV, Academic Press, New York (1975-78).

[22] B. Ruf, *Singularity theory and the geometry of a nonlinear elliptic equation*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa C1. Sc., (2), 17 (1990), 1-33.

[23] B. Sirakov, C. Tomei and A. Zaccur, *Results of Ambrosetti-Prodi type for non-self-adjoint elliptic operators*, arXiv:1701.05575.

[24] M.W. Smiley, *A finite element method for computing the bifurcation function for semilinear elliptic BVPs*, J.Comp.Appl.Math., 70 (1996) 311- 327.

[25] M. Taylor, *Remarks on Fractional Diffusion Equations*, www.unc.edu/math/Faculty/met/fdif.pdf .

[26] C. Tomei and A. Zaccur, *Geometric aspects of Ambrosetti-Prodi operators with Lipschitz nonlinearities*, Analysis and topology in nonlinear differential equations, Progr. Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl., 85, Springer, Cham, (2014) 445-456.

[27] K. Yosida, *Functional Analysis*, Springer, Berlin (1974).

[28] E. Zeidler, *Nonlinear Functional Analysis and its Applications, IV: Applications to Mathematical Physic*, Springer (1988), New York.

[29] L. Zhang, *A generalized Krein-Rutman theorem*, arXiv:16606.04377v1.

Marta Calanchi, Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Milano,
Via Saldini 50, 20133 Milano, Italia

Carlos Tomei and André Zaccur, Departamento de Matemática, PUC-Rio,
R. Mq. de S. Vicente 225, Rio de Janeiro, RJ 22453-900, Brazil

marta.calanchi@unimi.it
carlos.tomei@gmail.com
zaccur.andre@gmail.com